



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IX. — *Thericles, Potter, in the Light of the Greek Drama*

By WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

IN another connection we propose to study the work of Thericles of Corinth in the field of toreutics.¹ He was famous as an engraver of cups of the precious metals; he was still more famous as a manufacturer of earthenware, especially drinking cups. To such renown did his products attain that *Θηρίκλεια* became a hall-mark for standard cups — *Θηρίκλεια* (*sc. ποτήρια*) or *κύλικες Θηρίκλειοι*. They were highly prized by connoisseurs and collectors of vases even in the pre-Christian centuries. Timaeus speaks of a Thericlean cup as a royal gift (Ath. xi, 471 f.): *Πολύξενός τις τῶν ἐκ Ταυρομενίου μεθεστηκότων ταχθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν ἑτερά τε δῶρα παρὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ κύλικα Θηρικλείαν λαβὼν ἐπανήκεν* (*F. H. G.* i, 226). The "other gifts" may have been trifles or they may have been immensely valuable; but noteworthy it is that the only gift of the king that is expressly mentioned is the Thericlean cup. It may well have been of graven gold. Owners of Thericlean vases sometimes made much show of such treasures, though 'Thericleans' had various rivals among the knowing (Ath. xi, 471 e-472 a): *Ἀδαῖος δ' ἐν τοῖς περὶ Διαθέσεως τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπολαμβάνει Θηρίκλειον εἶναι καὶ Καρχήσιον. ὅτι δὲ διαφέρει σαφῶς παρίσθησι Καλλιξείνος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας φάσκων τινὰς ἔχοντας Θηρικλείους πομπεύειν, τοὺς δὲ Καρχήσια*. Whether the gift of Nicodemus was of gold or earthenware, Callixenus seems to be talking of two types of earthenware cups; for the Carchesium was regularly a cup of earthenware, while Plutarch has a different assortment of highly valued cups on the possession of which the owners display their pride (*Aem. Paul.* 33): *οἳ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας καὶ Σελευκίδας καὶ Θηρικλείους καὶ ὅσα περὶ*

¹ This paper is one of a series of studies on *The Contributions of the Dramatic Poets to Our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece*.

δείκνουν χρυσώματα τοῦ Περσέως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι. These Thericleans, too, may have been vessels of gold; or they may have been pottery. The association with the royal names Antigonus² and Seleucus, whose wealth was proverbial, and the inclusive clause about Perseus' gold dinner service incline us to favor the former hypothesis. Plutarch mentions Thericlean ware in various other passages where the context seems to point to the more costly material.³

At any rate, Thericles' bowls were fit for the use of a hero or a demigod, and Athenaeus, with a pardonable anachronism, suggests that it is a Thericlean from which Alexis makes Heracles refresh himself after the exhausting labors of getting Hesione free (XI, 470 e): ΘΗΡΙΚΛΕΙΟΣ· ἡ κύλιξ αὐτῇ ἐγκάθεται περὶ τὰς λαγόνas ἱκανῶς βαθυνομένη ὥτ' αὐτὴν ἔχει βραχεία ὡς ἂν κύλιξ οὔσα. καὶ μήποτε Ἀλέξης ἐν Ἡσιόνη Θηρικλείῳ ποιεῖ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πίνοντα, ὅταν οὕτως λέγει (frag. 85 K.).

γενόμενος δ' ἔννοος μόλις
ἤτησε κύλικα, καὶ λαβὼν ἐξῆς πυκνὰς
ἔλκει καταντλεῖ, κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν
ἀεὶ ποτ' εὖ μὲν ἀσκὸς εὖ δὲ θύλακος
ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστὶ.

The Thericlean cups were not only individual in shape and handsome, but they were also, it would seem, uncommonly capacious. A more striking allusion to the size of Thericles' cups is given by the bibulous woman in Eubulus' *Campylion* (frag. 43 K., quoted at p. 126 below). In Eubulus we have a contemporary witness. But we are not left to such indefinite allusions to the size of Thericleans for our conception of their capacity. Menander has one that held three cotylae — nearly a quart (*Menagyries*, frag. 324 K.): προπίνων Θηρικλείαν τρικότυλον. Theophilus has one still bigger and it

² Antigonids and Thericleans are associated again in Clem. Alex. *Paed.* II, 3, 35 (p. 69 Klotz): ἐρρέτων τοῖνον Θηρικλείοι τινες κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες καὶ κάναροι κτλ.

³ E.g. *Philop.* 9; possibly cheaper ware in *Alex.* 67.

is, furthermore, explicitly the product of the potter's craft (*Boeotis*, frag. 2 K.):

τετρακότυλον δὲ κύλικα κεραμεῖαν τινα
τῶν Θηρικλείων, πῶς δοκεῖς ; κεραννύει
καλῶς, ἀφρῶ ζέουσιν · οὐδ' ἂν Αὐτοκλῆς
οὕτως μὰ τὴν γῆν εὐρύθμως τῇ δεξιᾷ
ἄρας ἐνώμα.

The Thericlean this time is a drinking cup; it is made of earthenware; it holds more than a quart; it is convenient to handle. And Theophilus in another play mentions one that held seven cotylae (*Proelides*, frag. 10 K.):

καὶ κύλικ' ἀ(κράτου) Θηρίκλειον εἰσφέρει
πλέον ἢ κοτύλας χωροῦσαν ἑπτ'. B. ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.

A four-cotylae Thericlean were a cup for a Titan! What would be the state of the man who drained a seven-cotylae cup!

Thericlean vases were various as to material, size, and purpose. They were made of earthenware, gold, silver, glass, or wood. They varied from comparatively small to titanic. They were, for the most part and characteristically, drinking cups. But we have a crater also vouched for by no less an authority than Alexis (*Cycnus*, frag. 119 K.):

φαιδρὸς δὲ κρατὴρ Θηρίκλειος ἐν μέσῳ
ἔστηκε, λευκοῦ νέκταρος παλαιγένους
πλήρης, ἀφρίζων · ὃν λαβὼν ἐγὼ κενὸν
τρίψας, ποιήσας λαμπρόν, ἀσφαλῇ βάσιν
στήσας, συνάψας καρπίμοις κίσσου κλάδοις
έστεψα.

and a Thericlean 'cooler' (*ψυκτήρ*) vouched for by another comic poet, Dioxippus (*Philargyrus*, frag. 5 K.), if the commonly accepted reading is correct:

παρ' Ὀλυμπίχου δὲ Θηρικλείους ἔλαβεν ἐξιτάτους⁴
δύο ψυκτῆρας.

We have, then, in Thericlean ware, cups, mixing-bowls, and, possibly, coolers. But that is not all. Another poet of the

⁴ The Ms. reading ἐξ, εἶτα τοὺς, is metrically impossible.

New Comedy adds four more models (Dionysius, *Sozusa*, frag. 5 K.):

ὅσα δ' ἐστὶν εἶδη Θηρικλείων τῶν καλῶν,
γύναι, δικότυλοι, τρικότυλοι, δεινὸς μέγας
χωρῶν μετρητὴν, κυμβίον, σκύφοι, ῥυτά.
B. ποτήρι' ἢ γραῦς, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲ ἐν βλέπει.

Here, in addition to the types already mentioned, we have a huge dinos (a big round mug, as big as a keg and holding nine gallons), a tumbler-shaped cup, bowls (a mug-shaped bowl, drinking-cup), and horns, as well as cylices holding two or three cotylae. They are all drinking-cups, all Thericlean ware, and all are beautiful.

In Olympichus, named in the fragment of Dioxippus, we may possibly have the name of a dealer who sold Thericlean ware; or he may be simply the person from whom the subject of the sentence received the coolers.

But generally the Thericlean is a drinking-cup. Usually we find only the adjective used substantively; and the nouns to which the epithets *Θηρίκλεια* and *Θηρίκλαιοι* were applied were, respectively, *ποτήρια* and *κύλικες*. The cylix was, *par excellence*, the characteristic creation of Thericles. That is clear from the passage in which Athenaeus continues (xi, 470 e-f): ὅτι δὲ κύλιξ ἐστὶν ἡ Θηρίκλειος σαφῶς παρίσθησιν Θεόφραστος ἐν τῇ περὶ φυτῶν Ἱστορίᾳ [v, 3, 2]. διηγούμενος γὰρ περὶ τῆς τερεμίνθου φησί· “τορνεύεσθαι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ κύλικας Θηρικλείους, ὥστε μηδένα <ἄν> διαγῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας.” κατασκευάσαι δὲ λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεύς, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἔχει, γεγονῶς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνη. In this passage Athenaeus tells us several interesting facts about Thericles: (1) He was a potter, a manufacturer of earthenware; (2) he was a Corinthian; (3) he was a contemporary of Aristophanes; (4) he made a certain type of cup (cylix) that came to be called by his name; (5) that cups of that particular type, though made of most diverse material (wood, *e.g.*, as well as gold, silver, glass, and earthenware) and by most diverse

producers, were also called Thericlean because of their peculiar shape.⁵ We know that Thericlean cups were made at Athens and that the Athenian product also had an enviable reputation.⁵

If Thericles lived "in the time of Aristophanes," as Athenaeus states, he must have been an older contemporary. For we have his date fairly well established, if the restoration suggested in the text of the official catalog of the controller of the treasures of Athena in the Parthenon is correct (*I. G.* 170): [Θηρίκ]λειον περίχρυσον, σταχύες ΔΙ ἄνω ὑποξύλου καταχρύσων. The inscription, dealing in this item with one of the products of Thericles' art as an artist in metal work, dates certainly from about the year 421-420, whereas Aristophanes' first play was brought out in 427. In 421-420 Thericles had already made such a reputation that his products could be cited in official inscriptions simply as Θηρίκλεια; he could, therefore, have been no longer a mere youth; and in that year Aristophanes was but twenty-seven years old and had been before the public but six or seven years. It is safe to conclude that Thericles was a somewhat older contemporary of the comic poet.

In spite of clear and definite statements in regard to the life and work of Thericles, Welcker⁶ goes into an elaborate discussion to prove that our manufacturer of vases and cups never existed; that the name Θηρίκλεια was derived from θηρία, the beasts with which a certain type of cup was decorated. But he himself almost proves (*Kl. Schr.* 509), what would be perfectly correct, that if the vases had been named from the wild beasts the name must have been not Θηρίκλειον but θηραῖον. He saves himself by adding another stage in the evolution of the name: "The manufacturer, or the

⁵ Ath. XI, 469 b: *ἡΔΥΠΟΤΙΔΕΣ· ταύτας φησὶν ὁ Σάμιος Λυγχεὺς 'Ροδίου ἀντιδημιουργήσασθαι πρὸς τὰς Ἀθήνησι Θηρικλείους, Ἀθηναίων . . . χαλκευσμάτων τὸν ῥυθμὸν τοῦτον.* The type or shape would be the same, whether the vase were of metal or of clay. Compare also Ath. XI, 470 e, quoted on p. 122 above.

⁶ *Rh. Mus.* VI (1839), 404 ff., reprinted in *Kl. Schr.* III, 499 ff.

inventor, of such animal-vases would have been called Thericles." With that kind of juggling with Greek names, Homer at one time almost lost his personality, and Demosthenes, Nicias, Sophocles, Theocritus, and almost everybody else might be stricken from the realm of historicity and transformed into mere symbols of the things signified by their names.

The skepticism in regard to the historicity of Thericles seems to have begun with some unnamed authority of Athenaeus, who, after quoting a passage from the Stoic Cleanthes, goes on with a quotation from "others," which seems to have started all the trouble (XI, 471, b-c): Κλεάνθης δ' ἐν τῇ περὶ Μεταλήψεως συγγράμματί φησι · "τὰ τοῖνυν εὐρήματα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ἔτι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔστιν, οἷα Θηρίκλειος, Δεινιάς, Ἴφικρατίς · ταῦτα γὰρ πρότερον συνιστορεῖν τοὺς εὐρόντας. φαίνεται δ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν · εἰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖ τοῦτο, μεταβεβληκὸς ἂν εἴη τοῦνομα. ἀλλὰ, καθάπερ εἴρηται, οὐκ ἔστι πιστεῦσαι τῷ τυχόντι." ἄλλοι δ' ἱστοροῦσι Θηρίκλειον ὀνομασθῆναι τὸ ποτήριον διὰ τὸ μορφᾶς⁷ θηρίων αὐτῷ ἐντετυπῶσθαι. Πάμφιλος δ' ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν Διόνυσον τοὺς θήρας κλονεῖν σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλιξι ταύταις κατ' αὐτῶν.

Welcker's strongest argument against the historicity of Thericles seems to be the following (*Kl. Schr.* III, 506): "The more we think of the variety and of the age of the most attractive and most perfect forms of Greek vases, the more incredible — yes, the more absurd — would seem the idea that at so late a time a new form of vase (which could then have been nothing more than a variation of an older form and could call only for some certain modification and not for strict imitation) should have caught the public eye, found its way from Corinth to Athens, and there, under the name of a Corinthian potter, become so much the fashion that it kept goldsmiths and woodworkers busy reproducing the same and carried down through all antiquity the name of this one potter only, while from the whole number of vase-makers

⁷ *μορφᾶς* is Eustathius' correction for *δοράς*.

and vase-painters whose names have become familiar to us through the signed vases not one has made his way into literature."

But Lucian, who was as keen an art critic as any we know and who knew his history of art quite creditably, believed in the historical Thericles (*Lexiph.* 7): ποτήρια δὲ ἔκειντο παντοῖα ἐπὶ τῆς δελφινίδος τραπέζης, ὁ κρυψιμέτωπος καὶ τρυηλὶς μεντουργῆς εὐλαβῇ ἔχουσα τὴν κέρκον καὶ βομβυλιὸς καὶ δορυκύπελλον καὶ γηγενῇ πολλὰ οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὄπτα, εὐρυχαδῇ τε καὶ ἄλλα εὐστομα, τὰ μὲν Φωκαῆθεν, τὰ δὲ Κνιδόθεν, πάντα μέντοι ἀνεμοφόρητα καὶ ὑμενόστρακα. Lucian is describing a rich assortment of china. He has no more question of the historicity of Thericles than he has of that of Mentor. To this essayist Thericles was a potter; he made certain vases in fantastic forms — earth-born monsters. These were not the cylix pattern that Athenaeus emphasizes as peculiar to Thericles, but cups in the form of a griffin, a Pegasus, or some other fanciful creature. We have such vouched for in gold (Astydamos, *Hermes*, frag. 3 N.):

δέκα δὲ κυμβία,
ρέοντα δώδεχ', ὧν τὰ μὲν δέκ' ἀργυρᾶ
ἦν, δύο δὲ χρυσᾶ, γρύψ, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Πήγασος.

Photius and Suidas also accept the traditional Thericles, the potter. Defining the "offspring of Thericles," a phrase that occurs in the *Nemea* of the comic poet Theopompus,⁸ they explain: Θηρικλέους τέκνον · κύλιξ, ἣν λέγεται πρῶτος κεραμεύσαι Θηρικλῆς. Hesychius, too, thinks of him only as potter: Θηρίκλειος · κύλικος εἶδος ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους κεραμέως. And so also the *Etymologicum Magnum*: Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ἣν λέγουσι, πρῶτος κεραμεὺς ἐποίησεν, ὡς φησιν Εὐβουλος, ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμοδίας ποιητής. And Eubulus does in substance say just that — in two different plays: *Dolon*, frag. 31 K.,

διένιψα δ' οὐδὲν σκεῦος οὐδεπώποτε
καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμεν
ἢ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἥνικ' ἦν νέος,

⁸ Frag. 32, 1-3 K. (Ath. xi, 470 f.), quoted on p. 126 below.

and *Campylion*, frag. 43 K.,

ὦ γαῖα κεραμί, τίς σε Θηρικλῆς ποτε
ἔτευξε κούλης λαγόνος εὐρύνας βάθος;
ἥ που κατειδὼς τὴν γυναικεῖαν φύσιν,
ὥς οὐχὶ μικροῖς ἴδεται ποτηρίοις.

And Eubulus, "the poet of the Middle Comedy" (*Etym. Mag.*), was a contemporary, albeit younger, of the famous potter. In both these passages, we have plain allusion to pottery and to Thericles as a potter. There is also in the *Dolon* a hint at the date of Thericles. If "when *he* was young" is the correct interpretation, then there is, as Bentley long ago pointed out (*Phalaris*, I, 179 Dyce), a direct implication that Thericles was still living but perhaps no longer in active business when the *Dolon* was brought out; that he was an older contemporary of the poet. And that is in perfect accord, also, with the date assigned to the vase manufacturer by Athenaeus — the time of Aristophanes (see p. 122 above).

There is still another witness to the historicity of Thericles from among the comic poets, another slightly younger contemporary of the potter, Theopompus. The sole fragment of his *Nemea* (frag. 32 K.) begins:

χώρει σὺ δεῦρο, Θηρικλέους πιστὸν τέκνον·
γενναῖον εἶδος, ὄνομά σοι τί θώμεθα;
ἀρ' εἰ κάτοπτρον φύσεως, ἥν πολλῆρες δοθῆς.

If the cup was the "trusty child" of Thericles, Thericles must have been its parent, its fabricant.

Note, too, the affection with which this toper looks upon and greets his Thericlean cup. There is more than ordinary maudlin affection in the "trusty child;" there is still more affection in the "high-born beauty;" there is a touch of affection also in "nature's mirror." The affection is enhanced at the thought of the treasure "full."

Still another poet of the Middle Comedy seems to bear witness to the historical Thericles as a maker of cups (Antiphanes, *Homoeoe*, frag. 174, 4. 6 K.):

καὶ Διὸς Σωτῆρος ἦλθε Θηρίκλειον ὄργανον

.....
 ἕκαστος δεξιτερᾷ δ' ἔλαβεν.

In all these quotations from the Middle Comedy, the product of Thericles' art is drinking-cups; in the first, it is κύλικες; in the second fragment, the cup has, in accordance with the description in Athenaeus,⁹ the peculiar Thericlean shape with swelling body and more than ordinary capacity. Another of the qualities of the original Thericles ware was apparently the purity of the clay; though, obviously, the passage from the *Dolon* is the loud buffoonery of a slave who is regaling his hearer with his skill in "licking a platter clean." There is a play in the double meaning of καθαρώτερον — 'cleaner,' 'purer.'

Perhaps in consequence of the fineness of the clay and the delicate texture of Thericlean ware, these cups were more than usually fragile. At all events, we have two passages from the New Comedy in which Thericleans meet disaster: (1) Menander, *Theophorumene* (frag. 226 K.):

μέσως μεθύων τὴν Θηρίκλειον ἔσπασεν.

and (2) Alexis, *Agonis* or *Hippiscus* (frag. 5 K.):

μεστὴν ἀκράτου Θηρίκλειον ἔσπασεν
 κοίλῃν ὑπερβύουσαν.

In the word κοίλῃν 'hollow' there is probably an allusion to the deep, swelling body so characteristic of the Thericlean cylix.

In further confirmation of the historicity of Thericles, Pollux also knows of him as a manufacturer of cups (vi, 96): Θηρίκλειον καὶ κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων; and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* II, 3): ἐρρέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες καὶ κάνθαροι.¹⁰ Pollux thus declares explicitly that the name 'Thericlean' comes from the name of the maker; Plutarch and Clement leave the same to be

⁹ xi, 470 e, quoted on p. 120 above.

¹⁰ Cf. also Plut., *Aem. Paul.* 33, quoted on p. 119 above.

plainly inferred from the fact that they are giving a list of highly prized wares, all named from the owners or patrons of the manufacturing plants that produced them. Indeed, a marginal note in one manuscript of Clement adds (*Paed.* p. 121 Klotz): *Θηρίκλειοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους τοῦ εὐρόντος*. To the same effect we might quote also the *Etym. Gud.* (p. 261): *Θηρίκλειον · εἶδος ποτηρίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸ Θηρικλέους, ὥς φησιν Εὐβουλος*; and Moeris: *Θηρίκλειον · ἀπὸ τοῦ τεχνίτου προσηγορήθη, ὡς Εὐβουλος*; and Thomas Magister: *Θηρίκλειον · εἶδος ἐκπώματος, ἀπὸ τινος Θηρικλέους τοῦ πρώτου εὐρόντος τοῦτο, ὥς φησιν Εὐβουλος*.

To sum up the characteristics of the Thericlean cylix, then, we gather together the following details from the passages already considered: (1) Thericlean cups were made of the purest clay; (2) they had wide-swelling sides and were deeper than the ordinary cups; they had the general appearance, as Welcker describes them, of an inverted tenpin; (3) they had more than the usual capacity; (4) they had ears that were short but served as convenient handles. The fullest single description we have of Thericleans is given us in a fragment of Eubulus, the younger contemporary of Thericles (*Cybeutae*, frag. 56 K.):

ἄρτι μὲν μάλ' ἀνδρικὴν
τῶν Θηρικλείων ὑπεραφρίζουσιν παρά,
κωθωνόχειλον, ψηφοπεριβομβήτριαν,
μέλαιναν, εὐκύκλωτον, ὄξυνύδακα,
στίλβουσιν, ἀνταυγούσαν, ἐκνευμμένην,
κίσσῳ κάρᾳ βρύουσιν, ἐπικαλούμενοι
εἰλικον Διὸς Σωτήρος.

In corroboration of and in addition to the four characteristics listed above, we have in this passage of the comic poet a Thericlean cup that (1) is a man-sized affair; (2) has a lip like that of a Laconian beaker; (3) is made of fine stuff, so that the wine pouring into it makes it ring like a voting urn when the pebbles are poured into it; (4) is perfectly formed on the potter's wheel; (5) is painted shiny black

(μέλαιναν, στίλβουσιν), with red figures (ἀνταυγοῦσαν); (6) has an ivy wreath running about the brim (painted or real?); (7) has a 'pointed bottom.' There is something wrong about the last item. Either the word ὀξυπύνδακα must mean that the bowl sweeps inward to a thin neck connecting it with the base, like a huge goblet, or for ὀξυπύνδακα we should, as Kock suggests, read εὐρυπύνδακα 'with a broad base.'

The comment of the scholiast to Clement (*Paed.* II, 3, 35, p. 69 Klotz) does not help to clear up the difficulties: Θηρίκλειον · τὸ σφαιρικῶ τῷ πυθμένι τὸ ἐπικείμενον ἔχον χωνοειδές, ἀφ' οὗ πιεῖν ἐστὶν εὐπετές. "Funnel-shaped" or "pointed at the bottom" is just what the Thericlean bowl was not, according to Athenaeus and the other witnesses; and what a "spherical base" would be doing on a cylix it is hard to comprehend. The scholiast has only roiled the water.

That the typical Thericlean had a jet black varnish, however, we are assured not only by the comic poet Eubulus, but also by Theophrastus in the continuation of the passage quoted on page 122. Theophrastus, after declaring that the turpentine wood was μέλαν δὲ σφόδρα καὶ πυκνόν and that no one could distinguish a Thericlean cup turned out of such wood from an earthenware Thericlean, goes on (v, 3, 2): λαμβάνειν δὲ τὸ ἐγκάρδιον δεῖν καὶ ἀλείφειν τὸ ξύλον · οὕτω γὰρ γίγνεσθαι καὶ κάλλιον καὶ μελάντερον. This gives us a picture of a shiny, black vase with a fine gloss. Such the genuine Thericlean must have been.

But as we have already seen considerable variety in provenience, in material, and also in form of the Thericlean ware, so even in the peculiar matter of the Thericlean drinking cup itself there might be some variety. We have seen that the usual type of the Thericlean cup was deep, with bulging sides. But even a Thericlean might be flat and shallow, though still capacious. To such a cup Aristophon introduces us (*Philonides*, frag. 14 K., where a female servant speaks):

τοιγαροῦν ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρτίως ὁ δεσπότης
 δι' ἀρετὴν τῶν Θηρικλείων εὐκύκλωτον ἀσπίδα,
 ὑπεραφρίζουσιν, τρυφῶσαν, ἴσον ἴσῳ κεκραμένην,
 προσφέρων ἔδωκεν, οἶμαι, χρηστότητος εἶνεκα.

The bowl is of earthenware, turned on the potter's wheel (εὐκύκλωτον); it is wide and flat, like a shield (ἀσπίδα), and probably huge, like a shield — a bowl to satisfy another bibulous serving-woman (cf. the servant in Eubulus' *Campylion*, p. 126 above).

From the evidence submitted by so great a cloud of witnesses we can arrive at no other conclusion than that genuine Thericleans of clay were the product of a historical Thericles, and that this Thericles was not only a maker of silver and gold plate but also a potter who conducted a terra cotta plant at Corinth. The direct testimony of Athenaeus, declaring that Thericles was a potter and that he was a Corinthian, is not weakened by the fact that there is "wild-animal-fame" in his name, on which Welcker lays so much stress, nor by the possible suggestion that the real Thericles was exclusively a worker in metal, a maker of cups of silver and gold, of a peculiar type which came eventually to bear his name; and that these cups, highly prized by connoisseurs and by those who could afford to own them, gave rise to manifold imitations of them in clay; and that from these imitations, also called Thericlean, later writers spoke of Thericles as a potter, though his own art was exercised not at all in the field of ceramics but confined exclusively to that of toreutics.

Athenaeus may be a late witness; Lucian also is late; but Lucian, the keenest of critics, was not one to be misled by an illusion or by a fiction, and Lucian is very clear in his testimony that Thericles was a historical personage and a potter. Photius and Suidas and Hesychius are late, but they probably had good sources for their statements that Thericles was a potter. The *Etymologicum Magnum* is later still, but in the case of this witness the source is quoted — Eubulus, the

comic poet of Athens. And Eubulus, flourishing in the first quarter of the fourth century B.C., may as a lad actually have seen Thericles himself. There was no time between Thericles and Eubulus for the fiction to grow up that the Thericlean potteries were only imitations of Thericlean gold and silver ware; and we have the testimony of Eubulus himself to the fact that Thericles was Thericles and that he was a potter.

We need not attach any weight to the objection that Thericles is not named in the extant comedies of Aristophanes. Neither is any other potter or vase-painter, early or contemporary or late; nor to the further objection that Thericles is the only maker of vases or painter of vases whose name is immortalized in Greek literature; for we shall find one or two others; and it is within the range of possibilities that Euphronius or Brygus or Asteas or some of the rest may yet turn up with new discoveries of Greek literature now lost. But Thericles, at least, the Corinthian potter of the latter half of the fifth century, is historical.